

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 AMELIA BUTLER,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 MS. CANTY-BASHAM,

13 Defendant.

CASE NO. C19-965RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

14  
15 This matter is before the Court sua sponte following the Minute Order of the Honorable  
16 John C. Coughenour directing the Clerk to reassign this matter to the Undersigned. Judge  
17 Coughenour's order for reassignment followed Defendant's Notice of Related Cases (Dkt. #12)  
18 detailing the relatedness of this case and Case No. C19-964RSM. The Court agrees with Judge  
19 Coughenour and Defendant that these two actions are indeed related as provided in Local Civil  
20 Rule 3(g)(4) and that it appears that parallel litigation will be duplicitous and an undue burden  
21 on the Court and the parties.

22  
23 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42, where "actions before the court involve  
24 a common question of law or fact, the court may: (1) join for hearing or trial any or all matters  
25 at issue in the actions; (2) consolidate the actions; or (3) issue any other orders to avoid  
26 unnecessary cost or delay." FED. R. CIV. P. 42(A). Both a court's inherent power to control and

1 manage its own docket and the wording of Rule 42 support a court consolidating cases sua sponte  
2 and even over the objection of the parties. *Prestige v. United States*, No. CV-14-413-PHX-DKD,  
3 2014 WL 11332313, at \*2 (D. Ariz. Mar. 10, 2014) (citing *In re Adams Apple, Inc.*, 829 F.2d  
4 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1987) (“Because consolidation is within the broad discretion of the district  
5 court, . . . trial courts may consolidate cases *sua sponte* [.]”); *Blasko v. Washington Metropolitan*  
6 *Area Transit Authority*, 243 F.R.D. 13, 15 (D.D.C. 2007) (“By its plain language, Rule 42(a)  
7 permits *sua sponte* consolidation.”)).

8  
9 Nevertheless, the Court finds it appropriate to provide the parties an opportunity to  
10 address the issue. Accordingly, the Court finds and ORDERS that **within fourteen (14) days of**  
11 **this Order** each party may show cause: (1) why this case is or is not related to Case No. C19-  
12 964RSM and (2) why this case should or should not be consolidated with Case No. C19-  
13 964RSM. Any response to this Order shall be **limited to five double-spaced pages**. The Clerk  
14 shall mail Plaintiff a copy of this Order at: P.O. Box 3388, Federal Way, Washington 98063.

15  
16 Dated this 24 day of July, 2019.

17  
18 

19 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
20 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26